

BEVERLY GOBEN,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	Case No. 2:12-cv-00086-JCM-NJK
	)	
vs.	)	ORDER DENYING THIRD-PARTY
	)	DEFENDANT NORTH AMERICAN
WAL-MART STORES, INC., et al.,	)	ROOFING’S “JOINDER” TO
	)	MOTION TO COMPEL
Defendant(s).	)	(Docket No. 39)

Before the Court is the Plaintiff's emergency motion to compel, filed on March 15, 2013. Docket No. 36. That motion raises issues concerning, *inter alia*, the scope of categories to be asked at Plaintiff's Rule 30(b)(6) deposition of Defendant Wal-Mart. *See id.* On March 19, 2013, Third-Party Defendant North American Roofing filed a "joinder" to Plaintiff's motion to compel. Docket No. 39. That "joinder" seeks a ruling regarding the scope of proposed Rule 30(b)(6) topics for North American Roofing's planned deposition of Wal-Mart. *See id.* at 3. This is not a proper "joinder" and the Court hereby **DENIES** it.

North American Roofing is essentially bringing its own emergency motion to compel without satisfying: (1) the meet and confer requirements for such a motion, *see, e.g.*, Local Rule 26-7(b);<sup>1</sup> (2) the requirements for bringing a motion on an emergency basis, *see, e.g.*, Local Rule 7-5(d); or (3) the requirement to file points and authorities in support of the motion, *see, e.g.*, Local

<sup>1</sup> Indeed, it is unclear that there is any dispute at this point between North American Roofing and Wal-Mart. The “joinder” indicates that Wal-Mart has not objected to any of the identified topics raised by North American Roofing. *See* Docket No. 39 at 2-3.

1 Rule 7-2(d).

2 Because North American Roofing's "joinder" is actually an improperly filed motion to  
3 compel, it is hereby **DENIED**.

4 DATED: March 21, 2013

5  
6   
7 NANCY J. KOPPE  
8 United States Magistrate Judge  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28